

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application as amended is requested. By this amendment Applicant has amended the specification at page to correct an obvious typographical error, and has amended claim 3 to correct an informality noted by the Examiner. Claims 1-21 remain in the case.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-10 and 12-17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hall, Jr. ("Hall"). With respect to claims 1 and 10 the Examiner states that Hall teaches an apparatus having an analog sampling array (Fig. 2 signals from receivers 24) for acquiring from the signal under test (SUT) (or acoustic signals from the wheels) a plurality of temporally offset analog samples during each of the sequence of sample periods (see signals from the receiver in Fig. 2 and from the output in Fig. 3). Applicant submits that Fig. 2 of Hall shows two different signals and Fig. 3 shows sampling of one sample per sample period, not a plurality of samples per sample period as claimed. Hall samples and stores an input signal, and subsequently reads the stored data out at a delayed or time expanded output. There is no similarity between Hall and Applicant's invention as recited in claim 1.

Further the Examiner states that Hall has a plurality of sample processors (Figs. 4 and 5) for identifying logic level transitions between respective current and previous samples and for determining a time of occurrence of the logic level transaction (column 4, lines 44-63). Applicant again submits that Hall only has one processor per signal and does not identify logic level transitions since the signals being monitored are purely analog signals without digital information content. Hall merely identifies when the analog signal comes out of the noise in order to identify

a time relative to a transmitted pulse when the compression wave occurs. There is no similarity between Hall and Applicant's claimed invention since they are looking at different types of input signals – Hall a strictly analog signal and Applicant a digital data signal.

Therefore claims 1-21 are deemed to be allowable as being neither anticipated nor rendered obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art by Hall.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks allowance of claims 1-21 is urged, and such action and the issuance of this case are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

GARY K. RICHMOND

By 
Francis I. Gray
Reg. No. 27,788
Attorney for Applicant

TEKTRONIX, INC.
P. O. Box 500, MS 50-LAW
Beaverton, Oregon 97077
(503) 627-7261

Attorney's Docket No. 7281-US